FEB 1 7 2006

AF/IIW

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. **Application Number** 09/536,053 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date March 27, 2000 First Named Inventor **FORM** Michael K. Just Art Unit 2132 **Examiner Name** Kambiz Zand (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing) Attorney Docket Number 0500.9912151 Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC Petition Amendment/Reply (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Affidavits/declaration(s) Change of Correspondence Address Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request below): -return postcard Request for Refund **Express Abandonment Request** CD, Number of CD(s)_ Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C. Signature Printed name Christopher J. Reckamp Date Reg. No. 34.414 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature Date 2-14-06 Christine A. Wright Typed or printed name

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





Applicant:

Michael K. Just

Examiner:

Kambiz Zand

Serial No.:

09/536,053

Art Unit:

2132 Our File No.: 10500.00.2151

Filing Date: Confirmation No.: 5651

March 27, 2000

Docket No.:

0500.9912151

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION SECURITY TO PREVENT DIGITAL SIGNATURE FORGERY

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Certificate of First Class Mailing I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the

United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this date.

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action mailed November 21, 2005, Applicant responds as follows:

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 40-44 have been allowed and that claims 9, 11, 13, 15, 19, 28 and 37 would be allowed if written in independent form.

Remaining claims 1-7, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20-25 and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan et al. in view of Schmeidler et al. and further in view of Bisbee et al. In the "Response to Arguments" of the final action, there does not appear to be any response to Applicant's arguments with respect to the Chan reference nor to the requested showings requested by Applicant in the previous responses. For example, the cited portion of